But I cannot agree with Kramer's proposal to preserve, under the plenary powers, the name *Sphalerosophis* Jan, 1865, instead of *Spalerosophis* Jan, 1865, though the first mentioned spelling is the philologically correct one. The reasons for my objection are as follows:

When creating his genus of colubrid snakes, Jan introduced the generic name *Spalerosophis*. The spelling *Sphalerosophis* only occurs in this paper in connection with the naming of the type-species: *Sphalerosophis microlepsis*. The first revisor of this taxon was K. P. Schmidt (1930); he wrote *Spalerosophis* without mentioning the second spelling *Sphalerosophis* at all. His action therefore did not completely fulfil the provisions of Article 24a (1) of the Code. So Marx (1959) is the first author who selected the spelling *Spalerosophis* instead of *Sphalerosophis*, in accordance with the provisions of the Code.

While the spelling *Sphalerosophis* Jan cannot be found in any publication (except Kramer and Schnurrenberger 1963 and Lanza 1964) after 1865, not even in Boulenger's Catalogues (1893/96), nor in Neave (1940), the spelling *Spalerosophis* has often been used in revisions of this group of snakes and in comprehensive publications. The following list of authors may illustrate the abundant use of *Spalerosophis*: Anderson (1964), Barash & Hoofien (1956, 1961), Bons & Girot (1962), Boulenger (1893, 1896), Clark & Inger (1942a, 1942b), Domergue (1959: Spalaerosophis), Flower (1932, 1937), Haas (1951), Inger & Clark (1943), Khalaf (1959, 1960), Klingelhöffer (1959), Knarr (1959), Kramer & Schnurrenberger (1958), Loveridge (1957), Marx (1956, 1959), Mertens (1940, 1954, 1956a, 1956b), Minton (1962), Neave (1940), Parker (1931, 1938, 1941), Pasteur & Bons (1960), Romer (1956), Schmidt (1930, 1939, 1941, 1955), Schmidt & Inger (1957), Schmidt & Marx (1956, 1957), Villiers (1963), Wermuth (1957).

The proposed preservation of *Sphalerosophis* instead of *Spalerosophis* would be a minor but unnecessary change based on philological reasons, and being in contradiction with the Preamble of the Code to secure stability of a well known name in zoology. I therefore propose to amend paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) of Kramer's application as follows:

(2) to place the generic name *Spalerosophis* Jan, 1865, (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, *Sphalerosophis microlepis* Jan, 1865, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *microlepis* Jan, 1865, as published in the binomen *Sphalerosophis microlepis* (type-species of *Spalerosophis*) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic names *Chilolepis* Fitzinger, 1843, and *Sphalerosophis* Jan, 1865, on the official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE-SPECIES FOR *YOLDIA* MÖLLER, 1842 AND *PORTLANDIA* MÖRCH, 1857. Z.N.(S.) 1522

(see volume 21, pages 127–129)

By David Heppell (*Zoology Dept., Glasgow University, Scotland*)

I would like strongly to support the proposals of Dr. Soot-Ryen in the present application. The differing concepts of the genera *Yoldia* and *Portlandia* which obtained in the past were a result of opposing views on the interpretation of the type-species involved. Some authorities based these genera on the species actually named by the original authors, regardless of the discrepancies with the descriptions and cited figures; others on the nominal species actually before the authors. In this case we must take the latter view, otherwise " *Yoldia* " would have to be used for the genus usually known as *Portlandia*, while " *Portlandia* " would become a synonym of *Bathyarca*. Latterly, almost all authors have accepted the two generic names in the sense which Dr. Soot-Ryen now wishes to stabilise, even those who still cite the type of *Yoldia* as " *Nucula artica* Gray ". The reference to Wood, 1828 which was omitted from the list at the end of the application is, of course:

WOOD, W. 1828. *Supplement to the Index Testaceologicus*. London.